



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Kyle Bateman  
Serial Number: 10/602,547  
Filed: 06/24/2003  
Art Unit: 3641  
Examiner: Chambers, Troy  
For: Modular Ballistic Wall  
Attorney Docket: 2280.ACTI.NP

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313,1450

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the  
United States Postal Service via First Class Mail addressed to:  
Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313,1450 on Mar 15 2006

*[Handwritten signature]*

AMENDMENT

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated February 24, 2006, and the telephonic interview of  
March 7, 2006, Applicant submits the enclosed amendments and remarks.

## **INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

A telephonic interview was held on March 7, 2006 between Examiner Chambers, Randall Bateman, and Brett Peterson. The drawings were discussed. It was noted that the formal drawings contained several small discrepancies from the original hand drawings. Counsel for Applicant agreed to provide a new set of figures which corrects the discrepancies between the original drawings and the formal drawings, and to fix some omissions in the original drawings which are supported by the specification.

Counsel for Applicant discussed amending the claims to remove the term “seam” as the Examiner believes that “seam” defines a joint having no space between the two plates and because the presence or non-presence of a space between the plates is not an important part of the invention. Counsel for Applicant discussed how uneven edges, thermal expansion, vibration from striking bullets, etc. will typically vary the amount of space, if any, between the plates and the joint is accordingly designed to prevent bullets from passing between the plates even if a gap is present.

Counsel for Applicant discussed how the specification discusses and discloses in the Figures joints with and without space between the plates, using “seam” to describe the adjacent edges of the plates in both cases. As such, the application clearly discusses and shows both the presence and non-presence of a space. Counsel for Applicant therefore proposed adding a statement to the specification that as used, “seam” refers to the adjacent edges of the plates and does not require a space or lack thereof. The Examiner agreed to such a statement so long as the statement is supported by the application.

The Examiner agreed that the claiming of “keyholes” is proper, as the keyholes, although not clearly shown in the cross-sectional view of FIG. 3, are shown in the perspective views of the

plates shown in FIG. 1 and FIG. 1a. The plates of FIG. 1 and FIG. 1a are the same as shown in FIG. 3, and are discussed and numbered as the same plates.

Counsel agreed to promptly file a response so as to move the application into examination on the merits.